

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_118078
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the Influence of Fertilizers and bioinoculants on growth parameters of Guava (Psidium guajava L.) cv. L-49
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Moderate level. Very basic study. Details of treatments should be elaborated like what are the inorganic fertilizers included in RDF, contents of biofertiso; and bactobooster.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>satisfactory</p> <p>In result and discussion part, same format is used for all parameters to discuss the results. It makes the manuscript so monotonous. Some more effort need to be incurred for reframing the discussion part.</p> <p>The author is mentioning a particular treatment as superior wherein the CD values for that particular parameter is Non Significant (NS). Mere comparison of numerical values cant be a scientific discussion. Discussion part is not satisfactory. Highly superficial.</p> <p>3 references are missing in the text et al may be italicized</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The author may rework on this manuscript so that the results may be presented more scientifically	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K.G. Anitha
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India